

REMARKS

1. The Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for his courtesy during the interview of June 13 and 19, 2004 and his suggestions for amending the claims. Based upon the amendments, reconsideration and further prosecution of the above-identified application are respectfully requested in view of the discussion that follows.

Claims 1-40 and 42-43 are pending in this application. Claims 41-43 were objected to for a numbering error. Claims 1, 3-12, 14-17, 19-21, 23-32, 34 and 36-42 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Pat. No. 5,991,769 to Fino et al. in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,226,618 to Downs et al. Claims 2, 13, 18, 22, 32, 33 and 35 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Fino et al. in view of Downs et al. and the FTD website. After a careful review of the claims (as amended), it has been concluded that the rejections are in error and the rejections is, therefore, traversed.


The claims have been re-worded, as suggested by the Examiner, to recite first and second websites wherein the first website is password protected by a password of the customer and the second website is password protected by a password of the contractor. Support for the second website and customer password protection may be found in original claims 2 and 9. Support for contractor password protection of the second website may be found in the specification at page 19, lines 7-9.

In this regard, Fino et al. does not use a website. Downs et al. is directed to a third-party re-seller of copyrighted materials. FTD is limited to flower

arrangements. Since Fino et al., Downs et al. and the FTD website fail to teach or suggest the concept of associated websites protected by passwords of the customer and contractor, the claims as now amended, are differentiated over the cited references and the rejections should now be withdrawn.

2. Allowance of claims 1, 3-8, 10-21, 23-28, 30-34 and 36-42 as now presented, is believed to be in order and such action is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner be of the opinion that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of the subject application, he is respectfully requested to telephone applicant's undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,
WELSH & KATZ, LTD.

By 
Jon P. Christensen
Registration No. 34,137

July 22, 2004
WELSH & KATZ, LTD.
120 South Riverside Plaza
22nd Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 655-1500